UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,168	10/20/2003	Milind M. Buddhikot	Buddhikot 10-3-5-3-12-13	9461

46363 7590 11/09/2007

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/
LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC
595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702

EXAMINER	
RUSSELL, WANDA Z	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2616	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
11/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/689,168	BUDDHIKOT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wanda Z. Russell	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 October 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1-3, 9-11, and 15-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ozugur (Pub No. US 2003/0202505).

For **claim 1**, Ozugur teaches a gateway (DSG 36 and WiARP 38 –i.e. 32a– -Fig. 2. For DSG, see [0022], line 9) for mobile communications (Fig. 2), comprising:

a cache ([0021], line 6) for storing (maintain, [0021], line 8) network data ([0021], line 7) recently downloaded from a network (IP Network, 40-Fig. 2);

a mobile IP foreign agent (DSG 36 or 37-Fig. 2, and [0022], 7th line from the end); and

a packet filter (36-Fig. 2, and [0022], line 9) that directs (distribution, [0022], line 9) requests for the network data from a mobile node to the cache ([0022], lines 10-11),

the packet filter directing the requested network data from the cache to the mobile node by way of the foreign agent, without forwarding the requested network data to a home agent of the mobile node ([0023], lines 6-10).

For **claim 2**, Ozugur teaches the gateway of claim 1, further comprising a storage device ([0008], lines 3-4) that stores a state of the mobile node, the state of the mobile node being updated ([0021], line 9) in the storage device when the mobile node moves from the proximity of the gateway to the proximity of a second gateway having a second foreign agent ([0018], lines 6-8),

wherein the packet filter directs the requested network data from the cache to the mobile node by way of the second foreign agent, without forwarding the requested network data to the first foreign agent or a home agent of the mobile node, while the mobile node is in the proximity of the second gateway ([0018], lines 6-8, and [0023], lines 6-7).

For **claim 3**, Ozugur teaches the gateway of claim 2, wherein the state of the mobile node in the storage device is updated in response to a message from the second gateway ([0021], line 9).

For **claim 9**, it is a means claim corresponding to claim 1, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 10**, it is a means claim corresponding to claim 2, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 11**, it is a means claim corresponding to claim 3, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 15**, it is a method claim corresponding to claim 1, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 16**, it is a method claim corresponding to claim 2, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 17**, it is a method claim corresponding to claim 2, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 18**, it is a computer readable medium claim corresponding to claim 1, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 19**, it is a computer readable medium claim corresponding to claim 2, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 20**, it is a computer readable medium claim corresponding to claim 2, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 4-8, and 12-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozugur (Pub No. US 2003/0202505), in view of Forslow (U.S. Patent 6,954,790).

For **claim 4**, Ozugur teaches everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1).

However, Ozugur fails to specifically teach the gateway of claim 1, wherein the packet filter adds at least one packet-mangling rule to a set of firewall policies associated with the mobile node.

Forslow teaches the gateway of claim 1, wherein the packet filter adds at least one packet-mangling rule to a set of firewall policies associated with the mobile node (col. 5, lines 51-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine [Ozugur] with [Forslow] to obtain the invention as specified, to provide robust security for the local portion of workgroup networks and their individual server resources.

For **claim 5**, Ozugur and Forslow teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1, and 4). In addition, Forslow teaches the gateway of claim 4, wherein the at least one packet-mangling rule is user-specific (col. 5, line 51).

For **claim 6**, Ozugur and Forslow teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1, 4, and 5). In addition, Ozugur teaches the gateway of claim 5, wherein the gateway has at least one port for coupling directly or indirectly to an 802.11 access point ([0015], line 5).

For **claim 7**, Ozugur teaches everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1).

However, Ozugur fails to specifically teach the gateway of claim 1, wherein the packet filter performs multi-level filtering.

Forslow teaches the gateway of claim 1, wherein the gateway of claim 1, wherein the packet filter performs multi-level filtering (col. 14, line 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine [Ozugur] with [Forslow] to obtain the

invention as specified, to provide robust security for the local portion of workgroup networks and their individual server resources.

For **claim 8**, Ozugur teaches everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1).

However, Ozugur fails to specifically teach the gateway of claim 1, wherein the packet filter performs network layer filtering and one of the group consisting of transport layer filtering and application layer filtering.

Forslow teaches the gateway of claim 1, wherein the packet filter performs network layer filtering (WG Tier, col. 13, lines 33-34, and 27-30) and one of the group consisting of transport layer filtering (MVPN Tier, col. 13, line 30) and application layer filtering (ServiceNet Tier, col. 13, line 30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine [Ozugur] with [Forslow] to obtain the invention as specified, to provide robust security for the local portion of workgroup networks and their individual server resources.

For **claim 12**, it is a means claim corresponding to claim 4, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 13**, it is a means claim corresponding to claim 5, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 14**, it is a means claim corresponding to claim 6, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

Response to Amendment

5. Applicant's amendment filed October 1, 2007 has been received and considered.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed October 1, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. Applicant argues that Ozugur fails to teach at least "a cache for storing network data recently downloaded from a network..." as recited in independent claim 1.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As quoted by applicant, Ozugur teaches in paragraph [0021] that the ARP server includes an ARP cache (not shown) in which the MAC addresses of a mobile station and the access point serving it may be maintained. As currently implemented, however, the ARP server is updated whenever the edge router is involved in the communication. It is clearly stated that the ARP cache is for storing network data (addresses) recently downloaded from a network (Network 40 –Fig. 2).

Applicant may argue that the network data claimed in claim 1 is not addresses, and it may contain traffic information and the like. However it is not specified in claim 1 what kind of network data the cache stores. Addresses are one kind of network data. As cited in MPEP 2131.03, "[W]hen, as by a recitation of ranges or otherwise, a claim covers several compositions, the claim is 'anticipated' if one of them is in the prior art." Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citing In re Petering, 301 F.2d 676, 682, 133 USPQ 275, 280 (CCPA 1962)). Therefore, Ozugur anticipates.

8. Applicant argues that the ARP cache is not part of the gateway.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As seen in Fig. 2 and paragraph [0022], Ozugur teaches DSG 36 (note that 36 could be FA as well. See [0022], last 3 lines) and WiARP Server 38 in Section 32a (see left side of Fig. 2). As stated in [0022], last 9 lines: "Of course, in a further embodiment of the invention, the WiARP server 38 may maintain similar information for mobile stations for which the DSG 36 serves as a foreign agent ("FA") therefore, thereby enabling the DSG 36 to route received IP data packets to the appropriate access point to which a mobile station is associated regardless of whether the DSG 36 is the HA or FA for the mobile station operating within the wireless network 30". It can be seen that the WiARP Server does part of the gateway functions, and therefore it is comprised in the gateway.

9. Rejection of dependent claims remains effective.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wanda Z. Russell whose telephone number is (571) 270-1796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00-6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (571) 272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

WZR

CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600